

Pure Spinor Formalism for $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$ backgrounds

Pietro Fré ^{a 1} and Pietro Antonio Grassi ^{b 2}

^a Department of Theoretical Physics, University of Torino, v. Giura 1,
10100 Torino, Italy and INFN - Torino, Italy,

^b DISTA, University of Eastern Piedmont, v. Bellini 25/g,
15100 Alessandria, Italy, and INFN - Torino, Italy.

Abstract

We start from the Maurer-Cartan (MC) equations of the $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$ superalgebras satisfied by the left-invariant super-forms realized on supercoset manifolds of the corresponding supergroups and we derive some new pure spinor constraints. They are obtained by "ghostifying" the MC forms and extending the differential d to a BRST differential. From the superalgebras $\hat{\mathbb{G}} = \text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$ we single out different subalgebras $\mathbb{H} \subset \hat{\mathbb{G}}$ associated with the different cosets $\hat{\mathbb{G}}/\mathbb{H}$: each choice of $\mathbb{H}$ leads to a different weakening of the pure spinor constraints. In each case, the number of parameter is counted and we show that in the cases of $\text{Osp}(6|4)/\text{U}(3) \times \text{SO}(1,3)$, $\text{Osp}(4|4)/\text{SO}(3) \times \text{SO}(1,3)$ and finally $\text{Osp}(4|4)/\text{U}(2) \times \text{SO}(1,3)$ the bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom match in order to provide a $c = 0$ superconformal field theory. We construct both the Green-Schwarz and the pure spinor sigma model for the case $\text{Osp}(6|4)/\text{U}(3) \times \text{SO}(1,3)$ corresponding to $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^3$. The pure spinor sigma model can be consistently quantized.

¹fre@to.infn.it

²pgrassi@cern.ch

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The $\text{OSp}(\mathcal{N} 4)$ supergroup, its superalgebra and its supercosets	4
2.1	The superalgebra	4
3	The relevant supercosets and their relation	7
3.1	Finite supergroup elements	8
3.2	The coset representative of $\text{OSp}(\mathcal{N} 4)/\text{SO}(\mathcal{N}) \times \text{Sp}(4)$	10
4	Osp pure spinors	11
4.1	PS for $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N} 4)$	12
4.2	PS for $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N} 4)/\text{SO}(\mathcal{N}-1) \times \text{SO}(1,3)$	13
4.3	PS for $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N} 4)/\text{U}(\mathcal{N}/2) \times \text{SO}(1,3)$	15
4.4	PS for $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N} 4)/\text{SO}(\mathcal{N}) \times \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$	17
5	Pure Spinor Sigma Model for $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{CP}^3$	17
6	Conclusions and Future Work	22
A	D=6 gamma matrix basis	24
A.1	D=4 γ -matrix basis and spinor identities	25

1 Introduction

Due to the recent developments in constructing the AdS/CFT dual of supeconformal Chern-Simons theory [1, 2, 3], it became rather important to develop a formalism to quantize superstrings on backgrounds of the form $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^3$ [4] (see also [5]). The formalism suitable for that purpose is, of course, the pure spinor formalism [6] where the supersymmetry and the bosonic isometries of the target space can be maintained manifest to all stages of the computations. In addition, due to the manifest supersymmetry, the coupling with the RR fields is simplified, or to be more precise, they appear linearly

coupled to the sigma model fields [7]. Naturally, the RR fields appear also in the higher-component expansion of the superfields entering the Green-Schwarz sigma models (see for example [9]), but the pure spinor sigma model contains a new coupling with the RR which breaks the kappa-symmetry of the action Green Schwarz action leading to a quantizable field theory model [8].

In the present paper, we first recall some of the ingredients of the construction, but differently from the construction performed in paper [10], we observe that the number of the pure spinor degrees of freedom for different anti-de Sitter compactifications can be directly obtained by analyzing just the Maurer-Cartan forms related with their cosets. Given the supergroup $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$, we construct the corresponding Maurer-Cartan equations (see [11] for a complete description of these group manifold and the explicit form of the MC forms). This is a standard procedure. Next we ghostify the Maurer Cartan system extending the superforms to generalized forms by shifting each of fermionic forms by means of a commuting 0-form denoted in the text by Λ (see also [12]). In addition, we extend the differential d with a BRST differential $\mathcal{S}$. The latter, is nilpotent only upon some constraints on Λ 's. As was explained in [10], projecting the BRST variations of the target space fields onto the worldsheet and by identifying the commuting 0-forms Λ with the pure spinor on the worldsheet, we find some new constraints for the pure spinor fields [13]³. As shown in [13], the new pure spinor constraints are equivalent to the original ones and therefore, we obtain a new form of the sigma model action which has the same coupling as those in the work of Berkovits and Howe [16].

Since our approach is meant to work for any background, we can apply it to the cases with less conserved supersymmetry as the background $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^3$. However, before getting to this particularly relevant example, we analyze several different ways to produce consistent backgrounds for critical and non-critical dimensions by modding the supergroup $\hat{G} \equiv \text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$, with respect to different subgroups $H \subset \hat{G}$ which are always chosen bosonic. In particular we consider the supergroup manifold $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$. This case does not lead to any consistent background since the solution of the pure spinor constraints has zero non-vanishing components. Then, we move to the case of $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)/\text{SO}(\mathcal{N}-1) \times \text{SO}(1,3)$. Now, since we have modded out the subgroup $\text{SO}(\mathcal{N}-1) \times \text{SO}(1,3)$, we have to consider the nilpotency of the BRST differential modulo the gauge symmetry of the subgroup. This leads to new pure spinor constraints. We found that the matching between bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom is possible only for $\mathcal{N} = 4$ and the bosonic subset of the

³In 10d, in [6] the Cartan pure spinors are taken into account [15]. They look different, but as was discussed in [13] they coincide upon some redefinitions.

coset $\text{Osp}(4|4)/\text{SO}(3) \times \text{SO}(1, 3)$ corresponds to $\text{AdS}_4 \times \text{S}^3$. So, it would be a consistent background for a 7 dimensional supergravity. We do not dwell on this case in the present paper.

We move to the more interesting example where the subgroup is $U(\mathcal{N}/2) \times \text{SO}(1, 3)$. There we find a new modified forms of the pure spinor constraints which we are able to solve. We found that there are two cases where the matching to the bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom takes place, namely for $\mathcal{N} = 4$ and $\mathcal{N} = 6$. The bosonic part of these cosets correspond to the backgrounds $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^3$. They both have RR fields in the spectrum, in particular for the first case there is a two form in $\mathbb{P}^1$ which coincides with the Kähler form on $\mathbb{P}^1$ and with a RR 4-form on AdS_4 . The same for the case of $\mathbb{P}^3$. The first background would be a consistent background for non-critical string in 6 dimensions and it might be verified that that solution exists for supergravity in $d=6$ with $N = 4$ supersymmetry (corresponding to 16 supercharges in 4 dimensions). The second example is of course more interesting and it has $\mathcal{N} = 6$ supersymmetry.

The last example is a critical theory in 10 dimensions and therefore we can write down the corresponding sigma model. This is done in the last section where all the ingredients are described and the action is also presented. In addition, it has been noticed that by decomposing the MC forms into $\text{SO}(1, 3)$ representations, one finds that the superalgebra admits the famous $\mathbb{Z}_4$ discrete symmetry. The action is constructed respecting such a symmetry. We start by constructing the Green-Schwarz action with κ -symmetry. The action takes the standard form of a quadratic action where the principal term is the usual quadratic action written of the bosonic MC forms; the second addend contains the WZ terms which can also be written as a quadratic expression in the fermionic MC forms. This is a normal evenience for backgrounds of the form $\text{AdS}_q \times \mathbb{S}^p$ [17]. It can be shown that κ -symmetry reduces correctly the 24 fermions to the 16 light-cone degrees of freedom and that reparametrization invariance reduces the bosonic coordinates to light-cone ones.

While completing the present paper, two other contributions [19] and [20] appeared on arXive with a partial overlap with our results. We therefore do not discuss κ -symmetry, but we proceed with the construction of the pure spinor sigma model. The resulting sigma model has 24 manifest supersymmetries and it can be covariantly quantized. In addition, since the formalism to construct the pure spinor sigma model given a Green-Schwaz action was discussed in several papers, we refer to [21] since it is adapted also to non-critical backgrounds with less supersymmetry [22].

There are some important remarks that we would like to make: first, the pure spinor sigma model seems to respect, at least at the first expansion in α' , the cancellation

between bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom. Indeed the 10 dimensional bosonic coordinates are cancelled by the 24 fermionic coordinates and by the 14 pure spinor fields and their conjugated. In order to compare it with the most studied case of $\text{AdS}_5 \times \mathbb{S}^5$, we recall that since there are 32 manifest supersymmetries we need to have 22 pure spinor fields in order to saturate the central charge. In [7], it has been discussed the pure spinor constraints for closed type IIB superstrings (see also [28] for pure spinor constraints written in $\text{PSU}(2, 2|4)$ basis) and it has been noticed that they are sufficient to compensate the rest of the coordinates. In the case of $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^3$, with less conserved supersymmetry we consistently remove 8 fermionic coordinates and 8 pure spinors from the 32 fermionic θ coordinates and from the 22 pure spinors, leading to the result of the present paper. It can be also checked that the pure spinor constraints derived as in [10] (the complete discussion will be presented elsewhere [29]) lead to the same conclusion. Not only that. In the forthcoming paper [29] we show that the pure spinor action and the BRST transformation rules derived here from the algebraic structure of the Maurer Cartan system can be obtained systematically by localizing on the chosen supergravity background $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^3$ the general action discussed in [10]. Secondly we note that the nominator supergroup $\widehat{\text{G}} = \text{Osp}(6|4)$ in the supercoset is a super-Calabi-Yau and therefore, it is conceivable that the cancellations between bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom happen also here as $\text{PSU}(2, 2|4)$. However, the proof of the conformal invariance given in [8] does not seem to be possible using the technique described in [30]. Thirdly, the construction of non-local charges, and the analysis of the integrability can be extended to quantum level as in [32].

2 The $\text{OSp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$ supergroup, its superalgebra and its supercosets

2.1 The superalgebra

The real form $\mathfrak{osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$ of the complex $\mathfrak{osp}(\mathcal{N}|4, \mathbb{C})$ Lie superalgebra which is relevant for the study of $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ compactifications is that one where the ordinary Lie subalgebra is the following:

$$\mathfrak{sp}(4, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathfrak{so}(\mathcal{N}) \subset \mathfrak{osp}(\mathcal{N}|4) \quad (2.1)$$

This is quite obvious because of the isomorphism $\mathfrak{sp}(4, \mathbb{R}) \simeq \mathfrak{so}(2, 3)$ which identifies $\mathfrak{sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ with the isometry algebra of anti de Sitter space. The compact algebra $\mathfrak{so}(\mathcal{N})$ is instead the R-symmetry algebra acting on the supersymmetry charges.

The superalgebra $\mathfrak{osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$ can be introduced as follows: consider the two graded $(4 + \mathcal{N}) \times (4 + \mathcal{N})$ matrices:

$$\widehat{C} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} C \gamma_5 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -\frac{i}{4e} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}} \end{array} \right) ; \quad \widehat{H} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} i \gamma_0 \gamma_5 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -\frac{1}{4e} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}} \end{array} \right) \quad (2.2)$$

where C is the charge conjugation matrix in $D = 4$. The matrix $\widehat{C}$ has the property that its upper block is antisymmetric while its lower one is symmetric. On the other hand, the matrix $\widehat{H}$ has the property that both its upper and lower blocks are hermitian. The $\mathfrak{osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$ Lie algebra is then defined as the set of graded matrices Λ satisfying the two conditions:

$$\Lambda^T \widehat{C} + \widehat{C} \Lambda = 0 \quad (2.3)$$

$$\Lambda^\dagger \widehat{H} + \widehat{H} \Lambda = 0 \quad (2.4)$$

Eq.(2.3) defines the complex $\mathfrak{osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$ superalgebra while eq.(2.4) restricts it to the appropriate real section where the ordinary Lie subalgebra is (2.1). The specific form of the matrices $\widehat{C}$ and $\widehat{H}$ is chosen in such a way that the complete solution of the constraints (2.3,2.4) takes the following form:

$$\Lambda = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} -\frac{1}{4} \omega^{ab} \gamma_{ab} - 2e \gamma_a \gamma_5 E^a & \psi_A \\ \hline 4i e \bar{\psi}_B \gamma_5 & -e \mathcal{A}_{AB} \end{array} \right) \quad (2.5)$$

and the Maurer-Cartan equations

$$d\Lambda + \Lambda \wedge \Lambda = 0 \quad (2.6)$$

read as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} d\omega^{ab} - \omega^{ac} \wedge \omega^{db} \eta_{cd} + 16e^2 E^a \wedge E^b &= -i 2e \bar{\psi}_A \wedge \gamma^{ab} \gamma^5 \psi_A, \\ dE^a - \omega^a_c \wedge E^c &= i \frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi}_A \wedge \gamma^a \psi_A, \\ d\psi_A - \frac{1}{4} \omega^{ab} \wedge \gamma_{ab} \psi_A - e \mathcal{A}_{AB} \wedge \psi_B &= 2e E^a \wedge \gamma_a \gamma_5 \psi_A, \\ d\mathcal{A}_{AB} - e \mathcal{A}_{AC} \wedge \mathcal{A}_{CB} &= 4i \bar{\psi}_A \wedge \gamma_5 \psi_B. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Interpreting E^a as the vielbein, ω^{ab} as the spin connection, and ψ^a as the gravitino 1-form, eq.s (2.7) can be viewed as the structural equations of a supermanifold $\text{AdS}_{4|\mathcal{N} \times 4}$ extending anti de Sitter space with $\mathcal{N}$ Majorana supersymmetries. Indeed the gravitino 1-form is a Majorana spinor since, by construction, it satisfies the reality condition

$$C \bar{\psi}_A^T = \psi_A, \quad \bar{\psi}_A \equiv \psi_A^\dagger \gamma_0. \quad (2.8)$$

The supermanifold $\text{AdS}_{4|\mathcal{N}\times 4}$ can be identified with the following supercoset:

$$\mathcal{M}_{osp}^{4|4\mathcal{N}} \equiv \frac{\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)}{\text{SO}(\mathcal{N}) \times \text{SO}(1,3)} \quad (2.9)$$

Alternatively, the Maurer Cartan equations can be written in the following more compact form:

$$\begin{aligned} d\Delta^{xy} + \Delta^{xz} \wedge \Delta^{ty} \epsilon_{zt} &= -4i e \Phi_A^x \wedge \Phi_A^y, \\ d\mathcal{A}_{AB} - e\mathcal{A}_{AC} \wedge \mathcal{A}_{CB} &= 4i\Phi_A^x \wedge \Phi_B^y \epsilon_{xy} \\ d\Phi_A^x + \Delta^{xy} \wedge \epsilon_{yz} \Phi_A^z - e\mathcal{A}_{AB} \wedge \Phi_B^x &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

where all 1-forms are real and, according to our conventions, the indices x, y, z, t are symplectic and take four values. The real symmetric bosonic 1-form $\Omega^{xy} = \Omega^{yx}$ encodes the generators of the Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$, while the antisymmetric real bosonic 1-form $\mathcal{A}_{AB} = -\mathcal{A}_{BA}$ encodes the generators of the Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{so}(\mathcal{N})$. The fermionic 1-forms Φ_A^x are real and, as indicated by their indices, they transform in the fundamental 4-dim representation of $\mathfrak{sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ and in the fundamental $\mathcal{N}$ -dim representation of $\mathfrak{so}(\mathcal{N})$. Finally,

$$\epsilon_{xy} = -\epsilon_{yx} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.11)$$

is the symplectic invariant metric.

The relation between the formulation (2.7) and (2.10) of the same Maurer Cartan equations is provided by the Majorana basis of $d = 4$ gamma matrices discussed in appendix A.1. Using eq.(A.6), the generators γ_{ab} and $\gamma_a \gamma_5$ of the anti de Sitter group $\text{SO}(2, 3)$ turn out to be all given by real symplectic matrices, as is explicitly shown in eq. (A.8) and the matrix $\mathcal{C} \gamma_5$ turns out to be proportional to ϵ_{xy} as shown in eq. (A.7). On the other hand a Majorana spinor in this basis is proportional to a real object times a phase factor $\exp[-\pi i / 4]$.

Hence eq.s (2.7) and eq.s (2.10) are turned ones into the others upon the identifications:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{xy} \epsilon_{yz} &\equiv \Omega_z^x \leftrightarrow -\frac{1}{4} \omega^{ab} \gamma_{ab} - 2e \gamma_a \gamma_5 E^a \\ \mathcal{A}_{AB} &\leftrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{AB} \\ \psi_A^x &\leftrightarrow \exp\left[\frac{-\pi i}{4}\right] \Phi_A^x \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

As is always the case, the Maurer Cartan equations are just a property of the (super) Lie algebra and hold true independently of the (super) manifold on which the 1-forms are realized: on the supergroup manifold or on different supercosets of the same supergroup.

3 The relevant supercosets and their relation

Let us also consider the following pure fermionic coset:

$$\mathcal{M}_{osp}^{0|4\mathcal{N}} = \frac{\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)}{\text{SO}(\mathcal{N}) \times \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})} \quad (3.1)$$

There is an obvious relation between these two supercosets that can be formulated in the following way:

$$\mathcal{M}_{osp}^{4|4\mathcal{N}} \sim \text{AdS}_4 \times \mathcal{M}_{osp}^{0|4\mathcal{N}} \quad (3.2)$$

In order to explain the actual meaning of eq.(3.2) we proceed as follows. Let the graded matrix $\mathbb{L} \in \text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$ be the coset representative of the coset $\mathcal{M}_{osp}^{4|4\mathcal{N}}$, such that the Maurer Cartan form Λ of eq.(2.5) can be identified as:

$$\Lambda = \mathbb{L}^{-1} d\mathbb{L} \quad (3.3)$$

Let us now factorize $\mathbb{L}$ as follows:

$$\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L}_F \mathbb{L}_B \quad (3.4)$$

where $\mathbb{L}_F$ is a coset representative for the coset :

$$\frac{\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)}{\text{SO}(\mathcal{N}) \times \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})} \ni \mathbb{L}_F \quad (3.5)$$

and $\mathbb{L}_B$ is the $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$ embedding of a coset representative of AdS_4 , namely:

$$\mathbb{L}_B = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbb{L}_B & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{N}} \end{array} \right) \quad ; \quad \frac{\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})}{\text{SO}(1, 3)} \ni \mathbb{L}_B \quad (3.6)$$

In this way we find:

$$\Lambda = \mathbb{L}_B^{-1} \Lambda_F \mathbb{L}_B + \mathbb{L}_B^{-1} d\mathbb{L}_B \quad (3.7)$$

Let us now write the explicit form of Λ_F in analogy to eq.(2.5):

$$\Lambda_F = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \Delta_F & \Theta_A \\ \hline 4i e \bar{\Theta}_A \gamma_5 & -e \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{AB} \end{array} \right) \quad (3.8)$$

where Θ_A is a Majorana-spinor valued fermionic 1-form and where Δ_F is an $\mathfrak{sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ Lie algebra valued 1-form presented as a 4×4 matrix. Both Θ_A as Δ_F and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{AB}$ depend only on the fermionic θ coordinates and differentials.

On the other hand we have:

$$\mathbb{L}_B^{-1} d\mathbb{L}_B = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \Delta_B & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \quad (3.9)$$

where the Ω_B is also an $\mathfrak{sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ Lie algebra valued 1-form presented as a 4×4 matrix, but it depends only on the bosonic coordinates x^μ of the anti de Sitter space AdS_4 . Indeed, according to eq(2.5) we can write:

$$\Delta_B = -\frac{1}{4} B^{ab} \gamma_{ab} - 2 e \gamma_a \gamma_5 B^a \quad (3.10)$$

where $\{B^{ab}, B^a\}$ are respectively the spin-connection and the vielbein of AdS_4 , just as $\{\mathcal{B}^{\alpha\beta}, \mathcal{B}^\alpha\}$ are the connection and vielbein of the internal coset manifold $\mathcal{M}_7$.

Inserting now these results into eq.(3.7) and comparing with eq.(2.5) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_A &= L_B^{-1} \Theta_A \\ \mathcal{A}_{AB} &= \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{AB} \\ -\frac{1}{4} \omega^{ab} \gamma_{ab} - 2 e \gamma_a \gamma_5 E^a &= -\frac{1}{4} B^{ab} \gamma_{ab} - 2 e \gamma_a \gamma_5 B^a + L_B^{-1} \Delta_F L_B \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

The above formulae encode an important information. They show how the supervielbein and the superconnection of the supermanifold (2.9) can be constructed starting from the vielbein and connection of AdS_4 space plus the Maurer Cartan forms of the purely fermionic supercoset (3.1). In other words formulae (3.11) provide the concrete interpretation of the direct product (3.2). This will also be our starting point for the actual construction of the supergauge completion in the case of maximal supersymmetry and for its generalization to the cases of less supersymmetry.

3.1 Finite supergroup elements

We studied the $\mathfrak{osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$ superalgebra but for our purposes we cannot confine ourselves to the superalgebra, we need also to consider finite elements of the corresponding supergroup. In particular the supercoset representative. Elements of the supergroup are described by graded matrices of the form:

$$M = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A & \Theta \\ \hline \Pi & D \end{array} \right) \quad (3.12)$$

where A, D are submatrices made out of even elements of a Grassmann algebra while Θ, Π are submatrices made out of odd elements of the same Grassmann algebra. It is important to recall, that the operations of transposition and hermitian conjugation are

defined as follows on graded matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} M^T &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A^T & \Pi^T \\ \hline -\Theta^T & D^T \end{array} \right) \\ M^\dagger &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A^\dagger & \Pi^\dagger \\ \hline \Theta^\dagger & D^\dagger \end{array} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

This is done in order to preserve for the supertrace the same formal properties enjoyed by the trace of ordinary matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Str} (M) &= \text{Tr} (A) - \text{Tr} (D) \\ \text{Str} (M_1 M_2) &= \text{Str} (M_2 M_1) \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Eq.s (3.13) and (3.14) have an important consequence. The consistency of the equation:

$$M^\dagger = (M^T)^\star \quad (3.15)$$

implies that the complex conjugate operation on a super matrix must be defined as follows:

$$M^\star = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A^\star & -\Theta^\star \\ \hline \Pi^\star & D^\star \end{array} \right) \quad (3.16)$$

Let us now observe that in the Majorana basis which we have adopted we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C} &= i \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \epsilon & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -\frac{1}{4e} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}} \end{array} \right) = i \hat{\epsilon} \\ \hat{H} &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} i \epsilon & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -\frac{1}{4e} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}} \end{array} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

where the 4×4 matrix ϵ is given by eq.(A.7). Therefore in this basis an orthosymplectic group element $\mathbb{L} \in \text{OSp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$ which satisfies:

$$\mathbb{L}^T \hat{C} \mathbb{L} = \hat{C} \quad (3.18)$$

$$\mathbb{L}^\dagger \hat{H} \mathbb{L} = \hat{H} \quad (3.19)$$

has the following structure:

$$\mathbb{L} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathcal{S} & \exp \left[-i \frac{\pi}{4} \right] \Theta \\ \hline \exp \left[-i \frac{\pi}{4} \right] \Pi & \mathcal{O} \end{array} \right) \quad (3.20)$$

where the bosonic sub-blocks $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{O}$ are respectively 4×4 and $\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ and real, while the fermionic ones Θ, Π are respectively $4 \times \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{N} \times 4$ and also real.

The orthosymplectic conditions (3.18) translate into the following conditions on the sub-blocks:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}^T \epsilon \mathcal{S} &= \epsilon - i \frac{1}{4e} \Pi^T \Pi \\ \mathcal{O}^T \mathcal{O} &= \mathbf{1} + i 4e \Theta^T \epsilon \Theta \\ \mathcal{S}^T \epsilon \Theta &= -\frac{1}{4e} \Pi^T \mathcal{O}\end{aligned}\tag{3.21}$$

As we see, when the fermionic off-diagonal sub-blocks are zero the diagonal ones are respectively a symplectic and an orthogonal matrix.

If the graded matrix $\mathbb{L}$ is regarded as the coset representative of either one of the two supercosets (2.9,3.1), we can evaluate the explicit structure of the left-invariant one form Λ . Using the $\mathcal{M}^{0|4 \times \mathcal{N}}$ style of the Maurer Cartan equations (2.10) we obtain:

$$\Lambda \equiv \mathbb{L}^{-1} d\mathbb{L} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \Delta & \exp \left[-i \frac{\pi}{4} \right] \Phi \\ \hline -4e \exp \left[-i \frac{\pi}{4} \right] \Phi^T \epsilon & -e \mathcal{A} \end{array} \right) \tag{3.22}$$

where the 1-forms Δ , $\mathcal{A}$ and Φ can be explicitly calculated, using the explicit form of the inverse coset representative:

$$\mathbb{L}^{-1} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} -\epsilon \mathcal{S}^T \epsilon & \exp \left[-i \frac{\pi}{4} \right] \frac{1}{4e} \epsilon \Pi^T \\ \hline -\exp \left[-i \frac{\pi}{4} \right] 4e \Theta^T \epsilon & \mathcal{O}^T \end{array} \right) \tag{3.23}$$

$$\begin{aligned}e\mathcal{A} &= -\mathcal{O}^T d\mathcal{O} - i 4e \Theta^T \epsilon d\Theta \\ \Omega &= -\epsilon \mathcal{S}^T \epsilon d\mathcal{S} - i \frac{1}{4e} \Pi^T d\Pi \\ \Phi &= -\epsilon \mathcal{S}^T \epsilon d\Theta + \frac{1}{4e} \epsilon \Pi^T d\mathcal{O}\end{aligned}\tag{3.24}$$

3.2 The coset representative of $\text{OSp}(\mathcal{N}|4)/\text{SO}(\mathcal{N}) \times \text{Sp}(4)$

It is fairly simple to write an explicit form for the coset representative of the fermionic supermanifold

$$\mathcal{M}^{0|4 \times \mathcal{N}} = \frac{\text{OSp}(\mathcal{N}|4)}{\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R}) \times \text{SO}(\mathcal{N})} \tag{3.25}$$

by adopting the upper left block components Θ of the supermatrix (3.20) as coordinates. It suffices to solve eq.s(3.21) for the sub blocks $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{O}, \Pi$. Such an explicit solution is

provided by setting:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}(\Theta) &= (\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta^T\epsilon\Theta)^{1/2} \\
\mathcal{S}(\Theta) &= (\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta\Theta^T\epsilon)^{1/2} \\
\Pi &= 4e(\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta^T\epsilon\Theta)^{-1/2}\Theta^T\epsilon(\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta\Theta^T\epsilon)^{1/2} \\
&= 4e\Theta^T\epsilon
\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

In this way we conclude that the coset representative of the fermionic supermanifold (3.25) can be chosen to be the following supermatrix:

$$\mathbb{L}(\Theta) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} (\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta\Theta^T\epsilon)^{1/2} & \exp[-i\frac{\pi}{4}]\Theta \\ \hline -\exp[-i\frac{\pi}{4}]4e\Theta^T\epsilon & (\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta^T\epsilon\Theta)^{1/2} \end{array} \right) \tag{3.27}$$

By straightforward steps from eq.(3.23) we obtain the inverse of the supercoset element (3.27) in the form:

$$\mathbb{L}^{-1}(\Theta) = \mathbb{L}(-\Theta) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} (\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta\Theta^T\epsilon)^{1/2} & -\exp[-i\frac{\pi}{4}]\Theta \\ \hline \exp[-i\frac{\pi}{4}]4e\Theta^T\epsilon & (\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta^T\epsilon\Theta)^{1/2} \end{array} \right) \tag{3.28}$$

Correspondingly we work out the explicit expression of the Maurer Cartan forms:

$$\begin{aligned}
e\mathcal{A} &= (\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta^T\epsilon\Theta)^{1/2}d(\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta^T\epsilon\Theta)^{1/2} - i4e\Theta^T\epsilon d\Theta \\
\Phi &= (\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta\Theta^T\epsilon)^{1/2}d\Theta + \Theta d(\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta^T\epsilon\Theta)^{1/2} \\
\Delta &= (\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta\Theta^T\epsilon)^{1/2}d(\mathbf{1} + 4ie\Theta\Theta^T\epsilon)^{1/2} - i4e\Theta d\Theta^T\epsilon
\end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

4 Osp pure spinors

Having discussed the properties of the supergroup and its cosets, we develop the technique of "ghostyfying" the MC forms. This was already discussed in [10, 12] and it amounts to extending the differential d entering the definition of the MC equations to a BRST differential and to extending the fermionic MC forms with a ghost field Λ . The latter is a bosonic variable which will be identified with the pure spinor variable.

We first fermionize the MC forms for $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$ and we derive the set of pure spinor conditions for a generic $\mathcal{N}$. Then we compare this set of constraints with the constraints found from the supergravity approach and we discuss the number of independent parameters. Next, we consider the case of those supercosets that are of the form $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)/\text{SO}(\mathcal{N}-1) \times \text{SO}(1,3)$. Then, we consider the cases $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)/U(\mathcal{N}/2) \times$

$\text{SO}(1, 3)$ where $\mathcal{N}$ is an even number, and finally the case of the fermionic Grassmannian $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)/\text{SO}(\mathcal{N}) \times \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$. These cases produce three different types of pure spinor constraints that we analyze.

4.1 PS for $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$

We recall the Maurer Cartan equations (2.10)

$$\begin{aligned} d\Delta^{xy} + \Delta^{xz} \wedge \Delta^{ty} \epsilon_{zt} &= -4i e \Phi_A^x \wedge \Phi_A^y, \\ d\mathcal{A}_{AB} - e\mathcal{A}_{AC} \wedge \mathcal{A}_{CB} &= 4i \Phi_A^x \wedge \Phi_B^y \epsilon_{xy} \\ d\Phi_A^x + \Delta^{xy} \wedge \epsilon_{yz} \Phi_A^z - e\mathcal{A}_{AB} \wedge \Phi_B^x &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

and we fermionize them by substituting $d \rightarrow d + \mathcal{S}$ and $\Phi_A^x \rightarrow \Phi_A^x + \Lambda_A^x$. In addition, we do not add any ghost field to the bosonic MC forms. This is equivalent to say that we are not gauging any subgroup of the supergroup, but we are gauging only the fermionic variables. This interpretation is not completely satisfactory and we refer to [14] for a more detailed discussion.

This yields the transformations rules

$$\begin{aligned} s \Delta^{xy} &= -4i e \Lambda_A^{(x} \Phi_B^{y)} \delta^{AB}, \\ s \mathcal{A}_{AB} &= 4i \Lambda_{[A}^x \Phi_{B]}^y \epsilon_{xy}, \\ s \Phi_A^x &= -d\Lambda_A^x - \Delta^{xy} \epsilon_{yz} \Lambda_A^z + e \mathcal{A}_{AB} \Lambda_C^x \delta^{BC}, \\ s \Lambda_A^x &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

and the pure spinor constrains

$$\Lambda_A^{(x} \Lambda_B^{y)} \delta^{AB} = 0, \quad \Lambda_{[A}^x \Lambda_{B]}^y \epsilon_{xy} = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

The BRST transformations for Δ^{xy} , $\mathcal{A}_{AB}$ and Φ_A^x are nilpotent. This follows from the pure spinor constraints (4.3) and from the (anti)symmetrization of the spinorial indices of Λ_A^x . Notice that we have traded the form degree with the ghost number passing from Φ_A^x to Λ_A^x .

This set of constraints are not all independent. Indeed, by contracting the first equation with $\Lambda_C^z \epsilon_{yz}$, because of the second equation, it automatically vanishes. In the same way, by hitting the second equation with $\Lambda_C^z \delta^{CA}$, we get a redundant equation.

Now, suppose that we solve the first set of equations, the matrix $\mathcal{G}_{[AB]} = \Lambda_{[A}^x \Lambda_{B]}^y \epsilon_{xy}$ is antisymmetric and also nilpotent. However, any vector of the form $\Lambda_C^x \delta^{AC} F_x$ (with

Λ_A^x solution of the first set of equations) is an eigenvector of $\mathcal{G}_{[AB]}$. This means that, if there are enough parameters in the solution Λ_A^x , such that there are enough independent eigenvectors $\Lambda_C^x \delta^{AC} F_x$, then the matrix $\mathcal{G}_{[AB]}$ should vanish. However, it can be checked that there are solutions of the first equation which do not satisfy the second equation.

One convenient way to parametrize the solution is to decompose the $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ index into $\text{SO}(1, 3)$ irreducible representations. Since the vector representation of $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ is isomorphic to the spinorial representation of $\text{SO}(1, 3)$ we use the latter and we decompose the indices $x, y, \dots$ into $\alpha, \dot{\alpha}, \beta, \dot{\beta}, \dots$. Then eqs. (4.3) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_A^{(\alpha} \Lambda_B^{\beta)} \delta^{AB} &= 0, & \Lambda_A^{(\dot{\alpha}} \Lambda_B^{\dot{\beta})} \delta^{AB} &= 0, & \Lambda_A^{(\alpha} \Lambda_B^{\dot{\beta})} \delta^{AB} &= 0, \\ \Lambda_{[A}^{\alpha} \Lambda_{B]}^{\beta} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} + \Lambda_{[A}^{\dot{\alpha}} \Lambda_{B]}^{\dot{\beta}} \epsilon_{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

We decompose the pure spinors λ_A^α and $\lambda_A^{\dot{\alpha}}$ in the factorized form

$$\lambda_A^\alpha = \lambda^\alpha v_A, \quad \lambda_A^{\dot{\alpha}} = \lambda^{\dot{\alpha}} u_A, \quad (4.5)$$

where λ^α and $\lambda^{\dot{\alpha}}$ are two spinors of $\text{SO}(1, 3)$, while u_A and v_A are vectors of $\text{SO}(\mathcal{N})$. Notice that the decomposition (4.5) implies two independent gauge symmetries $\lambda^\alpha \rightarrow \rho \lambda^\alpha$ and $\lambda^{\dot{\alpha}} \rightarrow \sigma \lambda^{\dot{\alpha}}$ which are compensated by the transformations of $u_A \rightarrow \sigma^{-1} u_A$ and $v_A \rightarrow \rho^{-1} v_A$. Inserting factorization (4.5) in eqs. (4.4) yields the following remaining constraints

$$u_A u_B \delta^{AB} = 0, \quad u_A v_B \delta^{AB} = 0, \quad v_A v_B \delta^{AB} = 0, \quad (4.6)$$

which can be easily solved by adopting a light-cone decomposition of vectors u_A and v_A . Let us count the parameters: we get $2 \times (2 + \mathcal{N} - 1)$ from decomposition (4.5) (the -1 comes from the gauge symmetries) and we impose the scalar constraints (4.6). This leads to $2\mathcal{N} - 1$ parameters in the solution.

If we sum the bosonic coordinates $10 + \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{N} - 1)/2$ (associated with the bosonic subgroup) to the pure spinors $2\mathcal{N} - 1$ minus the fermionic coordinates $4\mathcal{N}$, we find that there is no solution with the match of the bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom. Even though, it seems consistent to construct a pure spinor model associated with the $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N} | 4)$ supergroup manifold, we do not have a string theory interpretation.

4.2 PS for $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N} | 4)/\text{SO}(\mathcal{N} - 1) \times \text{SO}(1, 3)$

As a second example, we consider the coset $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N} | 4)/\text{SO}(\mathcal{N} - 1) \times \text{SO}(1, 3)$ where we gauge the subgroup $\text{SO}(\mathcal{N} - 1) \times \text{SO}(1, 3)$ of the bosonic subgroup $\text{SO}(\mathcal{N}) \times \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$. From

the supergravity point of view this would correspond a compactification on a background of the form $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{S}^{\mathcal{N}}$.

Technically, our choice means that we add the ghost fields ξ_{IJ} associated with the subgroup $\text{SO}(\mathcal{N} - 1)$ (where $I, J = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N} - 1$) and the ghost field ξ_{ab} (where $a, b = 1, \dots, 4$) associated with the Lorentz group $\text{SO}(1, 3)$. For that, we decompose the matrix $\Delta^{xy} = \Delta^a \gamma_a^{xy} + \Delta^{ab} \gamma_{ab}^{xy}$ and the matrix $\mathcal{A}_{AB} = (\mathcal{A}_I, \mathcal{A}_{IJ})$. Accordingly, we decompose the MC equations. However, since we have now introduced the ghost fields associated with the MC forms Δ^{ab} and $\mathcal{A}_{IJ}$, we can reabsorb the non-vanishing right-hand side of MC equations by the BRST transformations of the new ghost fields except for the "pure spinor" constraints

$$\Lambda_A^x \gamma_{xy}^a \Lambda_B^y \delta^{AB} = 0, \quad \Lambda_I^x \Lambda^y \epsilon_{xy} = 0. \quad (4.7)$$

where we have decomposed the fermionic MC form Φ_A^x into (Φ^x, Φ_I^x) . For $\mathcal{N} = 8$, we can use triality to relate the vector index to spinor index and rewrite the second constraint as $\Lambda^x \tau^\alpha \Lambda^y \epsilon_{xy} = 0$ where $\alpha = 1, \dots, 7$.

The relevant BRST transformations are

$$\begin{aligned} s \Delta^a + \xi^{ab} \Delta^b &= -4i e \Lambda_A^x \gamma_{xy}^a \Phi_B^y \delta^{AB}, \\ s \mathcal{A}_I + \xi_{IJ} \mathcal{A}_J &= 4i \Lambda_I^x \Phi^y \epsilon_{xy}, \\ s \Phi_A^x + \gamma_{ab}^{xy} \xi^{ab} \Phi_A^y + \delta_{AK} \xi_{KI} \Phi_I^x &= -d\Lambda_A^x - \Delta^{xy} \epsilon_{yz} \Lambda_A^z + e \mathcal{A}_{AB} \Lambda_C^x \delta^{BC}, \\ s \Lambda_A^x + \gamma_{ab}^{xy} \xi^{ab} \Lambda_A^y + \delta_{AK} \xi_{KI} \Lambda_I^x &= 0, \\ s \xi^{ab} + \xi^{ac} \xi_c^b &= \Lambda_A^x \gamma_{xy}^{ab} \Lambda_B^y \delta^{AB}, \\ s \xi_{IJ} + \xi_{IK} \xi_J^K &= \Lambda_{[I}^x \Lambda_{J]}^y \epsilon_{xy}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

which are nilpotent because of the pure spinor constraints (4.7).

In addition, one can define a "covariant" BRST differential s_ξ by reabsorbing the ghosts ξ_{ab} and ξ_{IJ} . Then we can rewrite the first three expressions in (4.8) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} s_\xi \Delta^a &= -4i e \Lambda_A^x \gamma_{xy}^a \Phi_B^y \delta^{AB}, \\ s_\xi \mathcal{A}_I &= 4i \Lambda_I^x \Phi^y \epsilon_{xy}, \\ s_\xi \Phi_A^x &= -d\Lambda_A^x - \Delta^{xy} \epsilon_{yz} \Lambda_A^z + e \mathcal{A}_{AB} \Lambda_C^x \delta^{BC}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

which look similar to the original transformations. An important note: the new fields ξ_{IJ} and ξ^{ab} are not dynamical fields and they are just needed in order to make the gauge invariance manifest. The corresponding sigma model must be gauge invariant under the symmetries of the subgroup and therefore the new ghost fields do not enter the action. If

the ξ 's were to be dynamical, we would have to take them into account for counting the degrees of freedom.

Again, we can count the number of independent parameters in the pure spinor constraints. We can notice that in the case of maximal supersymmetry ($\text{SO}(8)$) the two set of constraints reproduce the 11 dimensional pure spinor constraints. However, for lower dimension the counting has to be performed. We adopt the same decomposition for the pure spinors Λ_A^x as for the fermionic MC forms Φ_A^x and we use the $\text{SO}(1, 3)$ spinorial indices $\alpha, \dot{\alpha}$ for simplicity. Eqs. (4.7) are re-written as follows

$$\Lambda_I^{(\alpha} \Lambda_J^{\dot{\beta})} \delta^{IJ} + \Lambda^{(\alpha} \Lambda^{\dot{\beta})} = 0, \quad \Lambda_I^\alpha \Lambda^\beta \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} + \Lambda_I^{\dot{\alpha}} \Lambda^{\dot{\beta}} \epsilon_{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} = 0. \quad (4.10)$$

Then, we propose the ansatz

$$\Lambda_I^\alpha = \lambda^\alpha u_I, \quad \Lambda_I^{\dot{\alpha}} = \lambda^{\dot{\alpha}} v_I, \quad \Lambda^\alpha = \lambda^\alpha, \quad \Lambda^{\dot{\alpha}} = \lambda^{\dot{\alpha}}, \quad (4.11)$$

which inserted in (4.10) leads to the remaining constraint

$$u_I v_J \delta^{IJ} + 1 = 0. \quad (4.12)$$

Then, counting the constraints and the dof, we get that the number of independent parameters for the pure spinors (4.10) is $2\mathcal{N} + 1$. Notice that there is no gauge symmetry left in the present case since Λ^α and $\Lambda^{\dot{\alpha}}$ are not gauge invariant.

Summing the bosonic coordinates $4 + (\mathcal{N} - 1)$ (notice that the internal space is a sphere $\text{SO}(\mathcal{N})/\text{SO}(\mathcal{N} - 1)$), the pure spinor coordinates $2\mathcal{N} + 1$ minus the fermionic coordinates $4\mathcal{N}$ we get a single solution for $\mathcal{N} = 4$. This is a remarkable result since the coset $\text{Osp}(4|4)/\text{SO}(1, 3) \times \text{SO}(3)$ corresponds a bosonic background $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{S}^3$ which is a background for $d = 7$ supergravity compactified on a 3-sphere. It could be understood as the compactification of 11d supergravity on $\mathbb{P}^2$ (this breaks the supersymmetry from $\mathcal{N} = 8$ down to $\mathcal{N} = 4$) leading to a d=7 supergravity with such an amount of supersymmetry..

4.3 PS for $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)/\text{U}(\mathcal{N}/2) \times \text{SO}(1, 3)$

The coset $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)/\text{SO}(\mathcal{N} - 1) \times \text{SO}(1, 3)$ is not the only interesting possibility. For example, for $\mathcal{N} = 2n$, we can divide by the maximal subgroup $\text{U}(n)$. This means that we have to add the ghost fields associated with the generators of the subgroup $\text{U}(n)$ and therefore we have to decompose the generators $T_{[AB]}$ of $\text{SO}(\mathcal{N})$ according to irreducible representations of the chosen subgroup as follows $(T_{[IJ]}, T_I^{\bar{J}}, T^{[\bar{I}\bar{J}]})$. The generators of the

subgroup are identified with $T_I^{\bar{J}}$ and we associate the ghosts ξ_J^I to them. Thus, the pure spinor constraints become

$$\Lambda_A^x \gamma_{xy}^a \Lambda_B^y \delta^{AB} = 0, \quad \Lambda_{[I}^x \Lambda_{J]}^y \epsilon_{xy} = 0, \quad \Lambda_{[\bar{I}}^x \Lambda_{\bar{J}]}^y \epsilon_{xy} = 0. \quad (4.13)$$

There are 4 constraints for the $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ part, and $n(n-1)$ constraints for the internal part to be compared with $2n$ constraints in (4.13). For example in the case of $\mathcal{N} = 6$, we have $4+3+3 = 10$ constraints. This case has a supercoset of the form $\text{Osp}(6|4)/\text{U}(3) \times \text{SO}(1, 3)$ which is the appropriate supergroup for the $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^3$ supergravity solution.

To solve the pure spinor constraints (4.13), we use again the decomposition into $\text{SO}(1, 3)$ spinorial indices and we decompose the index A into I and $\bar{I}$ with $I, \bar{I} = 1, \dots, n$. The constraints read

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_I^{(\alpha} \Lambda_J^{\beta)} \delta^{IJ} + \Lambda_{\bar{I}}^{(\alpha} \Lambda_{\bar{J}}^{\beta)} \delta^{\bar{I}\bar{J}} &= 0, \\ \Lambda_{[I}^{\alpha} \Lambda_{J]}^{\beta} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} + \Lambda_{[\bar{I}}^{\dot{\alpha}} \Lambda_{\bar{J}]}^{\dot{\beta}} \epsilon_{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} &= 0, \\ \Lambda_{[\bar{I}}^{\alpha} \Lambda_{\bar{J}]}^{\beta} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} + \Lambda_{[I}^{\dot{\alpha}} \Lambda_{J]}^{\dot{\beta}} \epsilon_{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

To solve them, we use the factorization

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_I^{\alpha} &= \lambda^{\alpha} u_I, & \Lambda_I^{\dot{\alpha}} &= \lambda^{\dot{\alpha}} v_I, \\ \Lambda_{\bar{I}}^{\alpha} &= \bar{\lambda}^{\alpha} u_{\bar{I}}, & \Lambda_{\bar{I}}^{\dot{\alpha}} &= \bar{\lambda}^{\dot{\alpha}} v_{\bar{I}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

defined up to $\mathbb{C}^*$ gauge transformations

$$\lambda^{\alpha} \rightarrow \sigma \lambda^{\alpha}, \quad \lambda^{\dot{\alpha}} \rightarrow \rho \lambda^{\dot{\alpha}}, \quad \bar{\lambda}^{\alpha} \rightarrow \bar{\sigma} \bar{\lambda}^{\alpha}, \quad \bar{\lambda}^{\dot{\alpha}} \rightarrow \bar{\rho} \bar{\lambda}^{\dot{\alpha}}.$$

and analogously for $v_I, u_I, v_{\bar{I}}$ and $u_{\bar{I}}$.

Inserting these factorizations into (4.15), we arrive at the constraints

$$u_I v_J \delta^{IJ} = 0, \quad u_{\bar{I}} v_{\bar{J}} \delta^{\bar{I}\bar{J}} = 0. \quad (4.16)$$

So, computing the number of independent degrees of freedom we get $4 \times (2 + \mathcal{N}/2 - 1) - 2 = 2\mathcal{N} + 2$. For $\mathcal{N} = 6$ we get exactly 14 pure spinors. In addition, by summing the bosonic coordinates $4 + \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{N} - 1)/2 - \mathcal{N}^2/4$ and the pure spinor contribution $2\mathcal{N} + 2$ minus the fermionic coordinates $4\mathcal{N}$. It turns out that there are only two solutions with the matching of the bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom for $\mathcal{N} = 6$ and $\mathcal{N} = 4$. The first case corresponds to the background $\text{Osp}(6|4)/\text{U}(3) \times \text{SO}(1, 3)$, the latter to the background $\text{Osp}(4|4)/\text{U}(2) \times \text{SO}(1, 3)$. The first one is a background for the critical type IIA d=10

superstring with the bosonic background $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^3$ and with the RR forms $\mathbb{G}^{[2]} \propto \mathcal{K}$ (where $\mathcal{K}$ is the Kähler 2-form on $\mathbb{P}^3$) and $\mathbb{G}^{[4]} = e\text{Vol}_4$ where Vol_4 is the volume form of the AdS_4 -space. The supersymmetry is $\mathcal{N} = 6$ for a specific choice of the dilaton v.e.v.. This example is the $\mathbb{S}^1$ reduction of the round $\mathbb{S}^7 \times \text{AdS}_4$ solution of 11d which has originally $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supersymmetries and loses two of them in the reduction. The catch of the reduction is the Hopf fibration of the round seven sphere: $\mathbb{S}^7 \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbb{P}^3$. The second example corresponds to a non-critical d=6 superstring (or better for d=6 supergravity) with the bosonic background $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and the RR forms $\mathbb{G}^{[2]} \propto \mathcal{K}$ (where $\mathcal{K}$ is the Kähler 2-form on $\mathbb{P}^1$) and $\mathbb{G}^{[4]} = e\text{Vol}_4$ where Vol_4 is the volume form of the AdS_4 -space. Notice the also $\mathbb{S}^3$ has a Hopf fibration: $\mathbb{S}^3 \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbb{P}^1$ so that we can argue that this model can be obtained from the $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \text{AdS}_4$ supergravity background discussed above. The residual supersymmetry is $\mathcal{N} = 4$.

4.4 PS for $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N} | 4)/\text{SO}(\mathcal{N}) \times \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$

By dividing the supgroup by the entire bosonic subgroup, we mean that we add the complete set of ghost fields associated with the generators of $\text{SO}(\mathcal{N})$ and of $\text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$. This means that all MC forms have their own ghost extension and therefore there is no pure spinor constraint left. Notice that in this case we have for any $\mathcal{N}$ a complete matching between the pure spinor fields and fermionic fields. This situation is described as a gauged linear sigma model by Berkovits and Vafa in [28]. The sigma model can be constructed as a WZW model and the corresponding Kač-Moody algebra realizes the loop generalization of the algebra of the coset.

5 Pure Spinor Sigma Model for $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{CP}^3$

The sigma model can be decomposed in the following pieces:

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 + \mathcal{S}_2 + \mathcal{S}_3 + \mathcal{S}_4 \quad (5.1)$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = \int e^+ \wedge e^- (\eta^{ab} J_{a+} J_{b-} + J_{IJ,+} J_-^{IJ} + J_{IJ,-} J_+^{IJ}) \quad (5.2)$$

in the conformal gauge. To make contact with the standard notation in the literature on sigma models, we introduce new names for the pull-back on the worldsheet of the MC

forms $(X : \Sigma_2 \rightarrow \text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^3)$

$$X^*(\Delta) = -\frac{1}{4}\gamma_{ab}H^{ab} - 2e(\gamma^a\gamma^5)J_a,$$

$$X^*(\mathcal{A}_{AB}) = U_{[AB]}^{JK}J_{JK} + H_I^J U^I_{J,AB} + U_{[AB]IJ}J^{JK},$$

and $U_{IJ}^{AB}, \dots, U_I^{J,AB}$ are the matrices converting the $\text{SO}(6)$ vector representation into $\text{U}(3)$ basis. So, J_{IJ}, J^{IJ} are the MC forms associated to generators of the coset $\text{SU}(4)/\text{U}(3)$ and H_I^J are the MC of the generators of $\text{U}(3)$. η^{ab} is the invariant metric on AdS_4 and $g_{I\bar{J}}$ is the $\text{U}(3)$ invariant metric, we denote by $k_{I\bar{J}}$ the components of the Kähler form on $\mathbb{P}^3$. The index I can be raised and lowered with the metric $g^{I\bar{J}}$, for example $J^{\bar{I}\bar{J}} = g^{\bar{I}K}g^{\bar{J}L}J_{KL}$ which is independent of J^{IJ} .

The MC equations discussed in (2.10) can be rewritten using the complex coordinates. We separate the H -connections H^{ab}, H_I^J from the vielbeins $J_a, J_{IJ}, J^{IJ}, \Phi_I, \Phi^I$

$$\begin{aligned} R^{ab} &\equiv dH^{ab} - H^{ac} \wedge H^{db} \eta_{cd} = -16e^2 J^a \wedge J^b - 2e \bar{\Phi}_I \wedge \gamma^{ab} \gamma^5 \Phi^I, \\ R_I^J &\equiv dH_I^J - H_I^K \wedge H_K^J = e^2 J_{IK} \wedge J^{KJ} + 4e \bar{\Phi}_I \wedge \gamma^5 \Phi^J, \\ \nabla J^a &\equiv dJ^a - H_b^a \wedge J^b = \frac{1}{2} \bar{\Phi}_I \wedge \gamma^a \Phi^I, \\ \nabla J_{IJ} &\equiv dJ_{IJ} - 2H_{[I}^K \wedge J_{J]K} = 4\bar{\Phi}_I \wedge \gamma^5 \Phi_J, \\ \nabla \Phi_I &\equiv d\Phi_I - \frac{1}{4}H^{ab} \wedge \gamma_{ab} \Phi_I - H_I^J \wedge \Phi_J = e J_{IJ} \wedge \Phi^J + 2e J^a \wedge \gamma_a \gamma_5 \Phi_I. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

The MC equations for J^{IJ} and Φ^I are obtained by conjugation from the last twos. The covariant derivatives are taken with respect to the gauge group $\text{U}(3) \times \text{SO}(1,3)$. It is also convenient to adopt another basis by decomposing the spinorial indices $x, y, z, \dots$ into $\text{SO}(1,3)$ indices. In particular, we decompose the spinorial MC forms Φ_I^x and Φ^{xI} as follows $\Phi_I^\alpha, \Phi_I^{\dot{\alpha}}$ and $\Phi^{\alpha I}, \Phi^{\dot{\alpha} I}$. Now, grouping these spinors into the two sets $(\Phi_I^\alpha, \Phi_I^{\dot{\alpha}})$ (where $\Phi_I^{\dot{\alpha}} = g_{I\bar{J}} \Phi^{\dot{\alpha} J}$) and $(\Phi^{\dot{\alpha} \bar{I}}, \Phi^{\alpha I})$, (where $\Phi^{\dot{\alpha} \bar{I}} = g^{\bar{I}J} \Phi_I^{\dot{\alpha}}$) we can organize the MC forms into the following subsets:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_0 &= \{H^{ab}, H_I^J\}, \quad \mathcal{H}_1 = \{\Phi_I^\alpha, \Phi_I^{\dot{\alpha}}\}, \\ \mathcal{H}_2 &= \{J^a, J_{IJ}, \bar{J}^{IJ}\}, \quad \mathcal{H}_3 = \{\Phi^{\alpha I}, \Phi^{\dot{\alpha} \bar{I}}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

and so doing the $\text{Osp}(6|4)$ algebra acquires a $\mathbb{Z}_4$ grading (as it is the case of $\text{PSU}(2, 2|4)$). This discrete symmetry is very useful for deriving the non-local conserved charges [18]. Notice that we have derived it for the MC forms, but it can be obviously discussed at the level of the algebra. Again, there is an overlap between our results and the results in [19, 20].

One of the important features of the supergravity background we are discussing is the possibility to write the Wess-Zumino term as a total derivative of a globally defined quantity. It reads as follows

$$\mathcal{H} = 4e J_a \wedge \bar{\Phi}_I \wedge (\gamma^a \gamma^5) \Phi^J + e J_{IJ} \wedge \bar{\Phi}^I \wedge \Phi^J + e \bar{J}^{IJ} \wedge \bar{\Phi}_I \wedge \Phi_J \quad (5.5)$$

$$= d \left(2i \bar{\Phi}_I \wedge \Phi^I \right). \quad (5.6)$$

and therefore we can write it on the 2d surface as

$$\mathcal{S}_2 = 2i\alpha \int \bar{\Phi}_I \wedge \Phi^I = 2i\alpha \int e^+ \wedge e^- (\bar{\Phi}_{I+} \Phi_{-}^I - \bar{\Phi}_{I-} \Phi_{+}^I). \quad (5.7)$$

where we have introduced a constant α in front of the WZ term. Notice that the WZ term is written by means of $\text{SO}(1,3)$ and $\text{U}(3)$ invariant tensors. The constant α is fixed by κ -symmetry which can be easily derived from the MC forms. In particular, we derive the general variation under a fermionic shift $\Phi_I, \Phi^I \rightarrow \Phi_I + \epsilon_I, \Phi^I + \epsilon^I$ where ϵ^I, ϵ_I are commuting spinors. (in previous sections we have denoted them by Λ_I and Λ^I and we have derived the pure spinor conditions). Then we have the variations

$$\begin{aligned} \delta J^a &= \frac{1}{2} \bar{\epsilon}_I \gamma^a \Phi^I + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\Phi}_I \gamma^a \epsilon^I, \\ \delta J_{IJ} &= 4 \bar{\Phi}_{[I} \gamma^5 \epsilon_{J]}, \\ \delta \Phi_I &= e J_{IJ} \epsilon^J + 2e J^a (\gamma_a \gamma^5 \epsilon)_I. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

It turns out that the action $(\mathcal{S}_1 + \mathcal{S}_2)$ is invariant if $\alpha = 1/(4e)$ and if the spinors ϵ_I, ϵ^I satisfy a suitable projection. This is similar to the κ -transformation of the $\text{AdS}_5 \times \text{S}^5$ model and we find that there is a relation between the worldsheet chirality, the target space chirality and the Kähler structure of $\mathbb{P}^3$, as expected. It can be proved that the κ -symmetry reduces consistently to 16 coordinates (which can be chosen to be light-cone coordinates). We refer to papers [19, 20] for a discussion on this point since we are interested in the pure spinor construction.⁴

So, the Green-Schwarz action (in the conformal gauge) is given by the simple quadratic action

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = \int e^+ \wedge e^- \left(\eta^{ab} J_{a+} J_{b-} + J_{IJ,+} J_{-}^{IJ} + J_{IJ,-} J_{+}^{IJ} + \frac{i}{2e} (\bar{\Phi}_{I+} \Phi_{-}^I - \bar{\Phi}_{I-} \Phi_{+}^I) \right) \quad (5.9)$$

written in term of the MC forms. The coupling constant can be put as an overall constant by redefining the MC forms. In order to see the discrete symmetry manifestly, we can

⁴We recall that the sigma model for plane-wave has been constructed and discussed in [24, 25, 27, 26].

rewrite the WZ term as follows

$$\int e^+ \wedge e^- (\Phi_{I\alpha+} \Phi_-^{I\alpha} - \Phi_{I\alpha-} \Phi_+^{I\alpha} - \Phi_{I\dot{\alpha}+} \Phi_-^{I\dot{\alpha}} + \Phi_{I\dot{\alpha}-} \Phi_+^{I\dot{\alpha}})$$

which has the structure of $\mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_3$ with respect to $\mathbb{Z}_4$ discrete symmetry.

The third term contains the RR fields $\mathbb{G}^{[4]}$ and $\mathbb{G}^{[2]}$. We recall that the 4d RR field is of the form $\mathbb{G}^{[4]} = e \epsilon_{abcd} J^a \wedge \cdots \wedge J^d$ and $\mathbb{G}^{[2]} = k_{I\bar{J}} J^I \wedge J^{\bar{J}}$ where $k_{I\bar{J}}$ is the Kähler form on $\mathbb{P}^3$ and $J^I = \epsilon^{IJK} J_{JK}$ and $J^{\bar{J}} = g^{\bar{J}J} \epsilon_{JKL} J^{KL}$. In the case of the $\text{AdS}_5 \times \mathbb{S}^5$ background and in the case of non-critical superstrings (see [21]), the form of the RR term is unique. Namely, due to the isometries, the form of the term is fixed. In the present case the invariance under $\text{U}(3) \times \text{SO}(1,3)$ is not sufficient to fix completely the RR terms and one requires the BRST symmetry to do it. In a parallel work we find a systematic way to produce the correct RR couplings [29].

As is been mentioned, we should add some new additional fields associated to the pure spinor setting. We introduce the conjugated momenta d_{Iz}, d_z^I and the anti-holomorphic ones $d_{I\bar{z}}, d_{\bar{z}}^I$. The form of the action is [?]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_3 = & \int e^+ \wedge e^- \left(\bar{d}_+ (\mathbf{1}_4 \otimes \mathbf{1}_6 + i\gamma_5 \otimes k_6) \Phi_- + \bar{d}_- (\mathbf{1}_4 \otimes \mathbf{1}_6 - i\gamma_5 \otimes k_6) \Phi_+ \right. \\ & \left. + i e \bar{d}_+ (\mathbf{1}_4 \otimes k_6 - 3 i \gamma_5 \otimes \mathbf{1}_6) d_- \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

where we recall that e is the coupling constant and it represents the flux of the RR field. The form of the matrix between the two d 's has been derived using the formalism [10], and a complete derivation will be presented elsewhere [29]. Since the d -terms can be integrated we get a simplified action

$$\mathcal{S}_3 = -\frac{i}{4e} \int e^+ \wedge e^- (\Phi_{I\alpha+} \Phi_-^{I\alpha} + \Phi_{\dot{\alpha}+}^I \Phi_{I-}^{\dot{\alpha}}) \quad (5.11)$$

The last term of the action contains two invariants, namely $1 \otimes g_{I\bar{J}}$ and $\gamma_5 \otimes k_{I\bar{J}}$ which are made of invariants under $\text{SO}(1,3) \times \text{U}(3)$ and the linear combination of these two invariants appearing in the action is fixed by the BRST symmetry. Notice that, differently from the case of $\text{PSU}(2,2|4)$, there are two invariants and this might imply that the model is not conformal invariant. However, this must be checked by an explicit one-loop computation. Nevertheless, it seems that the form of the RR-term reproduces the cases known in the literature [8] and [21] where the WZ term combines in a non-trivial way with the RR term producing a kinetic term for the fermions which is no longer invariant under κ -symmetry and therefore can be quantized.

We introduce the pure spinor Lorentz generators which are needed in the action and they determine the couplings between the pure spinor fields and the matter fields. In addition, they give the coupling with the Riemann tensor.

$$N_L^{ab} = \frac{1}{2} \overline{w}^I \gamma^{ab} (1 + \gamma^5) \lambda_I + \frac{1}{2} \overline{w}_I \gamma^{ab} (1 + \gamma^5) \lambda^I, \quad (5.12)$$

$$N_R^{ab} = \frac{1}{2} \overline{w}^I \gamma^{ab} (1 - \gamma^5) \lambda_I + \frac{1}{2} \overline{w}_I \gamma^{ab} (1 - \gamma^5) \lambda^I, \quad (5.13)$$

$$N_I^J = \frac{1}{2} \overline{w}_I \lambda^J, \quad \bar{N}_I^J = \frac{1}{2} \overline{w}^J \lambda_I, \quad (5.14)$$

The overline stands for the Dirac conjugation and they are gauge invariant under the gauge transformations generated by the pure spinor constraints

$$\delta w^I = \Xi_a (\gamma^a \lambda)^I + \Gamma^{IJ} (\gamma^5 \lambda)_J, \quad \delta w_I = \Xi_a (\gamma^a \lambda)_I + \Gamma_{IJ} (\gamma^5 \lambda)^J, \quad (5.15)$$

where Ξ_a, Γ_{IJ} and Γ^{IJ} are the gauge parameters of the infinitesimal transformations. It is also convenient to write them in the spinorial notation to get the two combinations of the first two operators

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\alpha\beta} &= w_{(\alpha}^I \lambda_{\beta)I} + w_{I(\alpha} \lambda_{\beta)}^I, & N_{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} &= w_{(\dot{\alpha}}^I \lambda_{\dot{\beta})I} + w_{I(\dot{\alpha}} \lambda_{\dot{\beta})}^I, \\ N_I^J &= w_\alpha^I \lambda_I^\alpha + w_{I\dot{\alpha}} \lambda^{\dot{\alpha}}, & \bar{N}_I^J &= w_I^\alpha \lambda_\alpha^I + w^{I\dot{\alpha}} \lambda_{\dot{\alpha}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

Finally, in terms of these ingredients, we can write the last piece of the action

$$\mathcal{S}_4 = \int e^+ \wedge e^- \left(\overline{w}_{I+} \nabla_- \lambda^I + \overline{w}_-^I \nabla_+ \lambda_I + R_{ab,cd} N_+^{ab} N_-^{cd} + R^I{}_{J,K,L} N_{I+}^J \bar{N}_{K-}^L \right) \quad (5.17)$$

where $R_{ab,cd}$ is the Riemann tensor of the AdS_4 space and $R^I{}_{J,K,L}$ is the Riemann tensor of the internal space $\mathbb{P}^3$. To check that all the pieces of the action fit together, we need to impose the BRST symmetry. This can be done by constructing BRST variations: Then we have the variations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} J^a &= \frac{1}{2} \bar{\lambda}_I \gamma^a \Phi^I + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\Phi}_I \gamma^a \lambda^I, \\ \mathcal{S} J_{IJ} &= 4 \bar{\Phi}_{[I} \gamma^5 \lambda_{J]}, \\ \mathcal{S} \Phi_I &= \nabla \lambda_I + e J_{IJ} \lambda^J + 2 e J^a (\gamma_a \gamma_5 \lambda)_I. \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

The BRST charge is nilpotent because of the pure spinor constraints and due to the gauge invariance under the gauge group $\text{U}(3) \times \text{SO}(1,3)$ and the invariance of the action can be checked by acting with the BRST charge on the different pieces of the action. We do not write here the computation since the structure of the action and of the BRST charge

looks very similar to the one presented in [8, 21] and therefore it can be analyzed by the same steps. Furthermore in the shortly forthcoming paper [29] we show that the action described in the present article can be exactly derived by localizing on the $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^3$ background the action discussed in [10] which was shown there to be BRST invariant on a generic supergravity background.

The supersymmetry $N = 6$ preserved by the background is still quite strong to imply the equations of motion, therefore we expect that the BRST charges applied to a generic vertex operator imply that the background fields are on-shell. In any case, this point deserves further investigations since we know examples such as those described in [22] where this does not happen.

6 Conclusions and Future Work

We have discussed several examples of AdS_4 backgrounds viewed as coset spaces of the supergroup $\text{Osp}(\mathcal{N}|4)$. We analyzed the pure spinor constraints in all cases and we found that only few of them admit an interpretation as supergravity backgrounds. Moreover, we discussed in detail the case of $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^3$ and we wrote down the Green-Schwarz model and the corresponding pure spinor action. The latter is more convenient since it has all 24 supersymmetries manifest. Notice, as was discovered in [8] the supersymmetry invariance of the action does not require any boundary term in contrast to the flat case. In addition, one can perform the limit as in [31] and the model can be described in terms of a gauged linear sigma model based on the superGrassmannian space $\text{Osp}(6|4)/\text{SO}(6) \times \text{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$. It would be very interesting to see what the amplitudes compute in the present context and we have to study the corresponding measure. We notice that as in the $\text{AdS}_5 \times \mathbb{S}^5$ case, there are singleton representations and it would be interesting to see whether one of these singleton representations of AdS_4 reduces to a superconformal Chern-Simons theory on the boundary in analogy with the AdS/CFT duality for $\text{AdS}_5 \times \mathbb{S}^5$ and for $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{S}^7$ [33, 34].

In a forthcoming paper [29], we analyze the pure spinor sigma model from the geometric perspective using the construction in [10]. In that context the pure spinor constraints can be derived from the rheonomic parametrization of type IIA supergravity. In order to adapt the rheonomic parametrization to the case $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^3$ we specify all terms in the action given in [10].

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to R. D'Auria, M. Trigiante, G. Dall'Agata, D. Sorokin, and M. Tonin for useful discussions. P.A.G. is grateful to P. Vanhove for invitation at the Institute for Theoretical Physics, Saclay, Paris where part of this work has been completed. P.A.G. would like to thank R. Roiban for valuable comments.

A D=6 gamma matrix basis

In the discussion of the $\text{AdS}_4 \times \mathbb{P}^3$ compactification we need to consider the decomposition of the $d = 10$ gamma matrix algebra into the tensor product of the $\mathfrak{so}(6)$ clifford algebra times that of $\mathfrak{so}(1,3)$. In this section we discuss an explicit basis for the $\mathfrak{so}(6)$ gamma matrix algebra using that of $\mathfrak{so}(7)$. Conventionally we identify the 7-matrix τ_7 with the chirality matrix in $d = 6$.

In this paper, the indices $\alpha, \beta, \dots$ run on six values and denote the vector indices of $\mathfrak{so}(6)$. In order to discuss the gamma matrix basis we introduce $\mathfrak{so}(7)$ indices

$$\bar{\alpha} = \alpha, 7 \quad (\text{A.1})$$

which run on seven values and we define the Clifford algebra with negative metric:

$$\{\tau_{\bar{\alpha}}, \tau_{\bar{\beta}}\} = -\delta_{\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

This algebra is satisfied by the following, real, antisymmetric matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} ; \quad \tau_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \\ \tau_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} ; \quad \tau_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \\ \tau_5 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} ; \quad \tau_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

$$\tau_7 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

A.1 D=4 γ -matrix basis and spinor identities

In this section we construct a basis of $\mathfrak{so}(1,3)$ gamma matrices such that it explicitly realizes the isomorphism $\mathfrak{so}(2,3) \sim \mathfrak{sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$ with the conventions used in the main text. Naming σ_i the standard Pauli matrices:

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

we realize the $\mathfrak{so}(1,3)$ Clifford algebra:

$$\{\gamma_a, \gamma_b\} = 2\eta_{ab} \quad ; \quad \eta_{ab} = \text{diag}(+, -, -, -) \quad (\text{A.5})$$

by setting:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0 &= \sigma_2 \otimes \mathbf{1} \quad ; \quad \gamma_1 = i\sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_1 \\ \gamma_2 &= i\sigma_1 \otimes \mathbf{1} \quad ; \quad \gamma_3 = i\sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_3 \\ \gamma_5 &= \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_2 \quad ; \quad \mathcal{C} = i\sigma_2 \otimes \mathbf{1} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where γ_5 is the chirality matrix and $\mathcal{C}$ is the charge conjugation matrix. Making now reference to eq.s (2.2) and (2.3) of the main text we see that the antisymmetric matrix entering the definition of the orthosymplectic algebra, namely $\mathcal{C}\gamma_5$ is the following one:

$$\mathcal{C} = i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{C}\gamma_5 = \epsilon = i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

namely it is proportional, through an overall i -factor, to a real completely off-diagonal matrix. On the other hand all the generators of the $\mathfrak{so}(2,3)$ Lie algebra, *i.e.* γ_{ab} and $\gamma_a\gamma_5$

are real, symplectic 4×4 matrices. Indeed we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{01} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} ; \quad \gamma_{02} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \\
\gamma_{12} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} ; \quad \gamma_{13} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
\gamma_{23} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} ; \quad \gamma_{34} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A.8}) \\
\gamma_0 \gamma_5 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} ; \quad \gamma_1 \gamma_5 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\
\gamma_2 \gamma_5 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} ; \quad \gamma_3 \gamma_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we find that $\mathcal{C}\gamma_0 = \mathbf{i}\mathbf{1}$. Hence the Majorana condition becomes:

$$\mathbf{i}\psi = \psi^\star \quad (\text{A.9})$$

so that a Majorana spinor is just a real spinor multiplied by an overall phase $\exp[-i\frac{\pi}{4}]$.

These conventions being fixed let χ_x ($x = 1, \dots, 4$) be a set of (commuting) Majorana spinors normalized in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_x &= \mathcal{C} \bar{\chi}_x^T ; \quad \text{Majorana condition} \\
\bar{\chi}_x \gamma_5 \chi_y &= \mathbf{i} (\mathcal{C} \gamma_5)_{xy} ; \quad \text{symplectic normal basis}
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Then by explicit evaluation we can verify the following Fierz identity:

$$\frac{1}{2} \gamma^{ab} \chi_z \bar{\chi}_x \gamma_5 \gamma_{ab} \chi_y - \gamma_a \gamma_5 \chi_z \bar{\chi}_x \gamma_a \chi_y = -2\mathbf{i} \left[(C\gamma_5)_{zx} \chi_y + (C\gamma_5)_{zy} \chi_x \right] \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Another identity which we can prove by direct evaluation is the following one:

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\chi}_x \gamma_5 \gamma_{ab} \chi_y \bar{\chi}_z \gamma^b \chi_t - \bar{\chi}_z \gamma_5 \gamma_{ab} \chi_t \bar{\chi}_x \gamma^b \chi_y = \\ & \text{i} \left(\bar{\chi}_x \gamma_a \chi_t (\mathcal{C} \gamma_5)_{yz} + \bar{\chi}_y \gamma_a \chi_t (\mathcal{C} \gamma_5)_{xz} + \bar{\chi}_x \gamma_a \chi_z (\mathcal{C} \gamma_5)_{yt} + \bar{\chi}_y \gamma_a \chi_z (\mathcal{C} \gamma_5)_{xt} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Finally let us mention some relevant formulae for the derivation of the compactification. With the above conventions we find:

$$\gamma_0 \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3 = \text{i} \gamma_5 \quad (\text{A.13})$$

and if we fix the convention:

$$\epsilon_{0123} = +1 \quad (\text{A.14})$$

we obtain:

$$\frac{1}{24} \epsilon^{abcd} \gamma_a \gamma_b \gamma_c \gamma_d = -\text{i} \gamma_5 \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Bibliography

- [1] J. H. Schwarz, “Superconformal Chern-Simons theories,” JHEP **0411** (2004) 078, hep-th/0411077.
- [2] J. Bagger and N. Lambert, “Modeling multiple M2’s,” Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007) 045020, hep-th/0611108; “Gauge Symmetry and Supersymmetry of Multiple M2-Branes,” Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 065008, hep-th/0711.0955. A. Gustavsson, “Algebraic structures on parallel M2-branes,” hep-th/0709.1260. M. Van Raamsdonk, “Comments on the Bagger-Lambert theory and multiple M2-branes,” JHEP **0805** (2008) 105 hep-th/0803.3803. J. Gomis, D. Rodriguez-Gomez, M. Van Raamsdonk and H. Verlinde, “The Superconformal Gauge Theory on M2-Branes,” hep-th/0806.0738. M. Benna, I. Klebanov, T. Klose and M. Smedback, “Superconformal Chern-Simons Theories and AdS_4/CFT_3 Correspondence,” hep-th/0806.1519.
- [3] O. Aharony, O. Bergman, D. L. Jafferis and J. Maldacena, “N=6 superconformal Chern-Simons-matter theories, M2-branes and their gravity duals,” hep-th/0806.1218.
- [4] B. E. W. Nilsson and C. N. Pope, *Hopf Fibration Of Eleven-Dimensional Supergravity*, Class. Quant. Grav. **1**, 499 (1984).
- [5] D. P. Sorokin, V. I. Tkach and D. V. Volkov, *On The Relationship Between Compactified Vacua Of $D = 11$ And $D = 10$ Supergravities*, Phys. Lett. B **161**, 301 (1985).
- [6] N. Berkovits, *Super-Poincare covariant quantization of the superstring*, JHEP **0004**, 018 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0001035].
- [7] N. Berkovits and O. Chandia, *Superstring vertex operators in an $AdS(5) \times S(5)$ background*, Nucl. Phys. B **596**, 185 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0009168];
- [8] N. Berkovits, *Quantum consistency of the superstring in $AdS(5) \times S^{*5}$ background*, JHEP **0503**, 041 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0411170].
- [9] R. R. Metsaev and A. A. Tseytlin, *Type IIB superstring action in $AdS(5) \times S(5)$ background*, Nucl. Phys. B **533**, 109 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9805028].
- [10] R. D’Auria, P. Fré, P.A. Grassi and M. Trigiante, “Pure spinor superstrings on generic type IIA supergravity backgrounds”, arXiv:0803.1819 [hep-th].

- [11] L. Castellani, R. D'Auria and P. Fre, *Supergravity And Superstrings: A Geometric Perspective*. Vol. 1,2,3. *Singapore, Singapore: World Scientific (1991) 1-603*
- [12] P. Fre and P. A. Grassi, *Free Differential Algebras, Rheonomy, and Pure Spinors*, arXiv:0801.3076 [hep-th].
- [13] P. Fre and P. A. Grassi, *Pure Spinors for General Backgrounds*, arXiv:0803.1809 [hep-th].
- [14] P. A. Grassi and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Gauging cosets*, Nucl. Phys. B **702**, 189 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0403209].
- [15] P. S. Howe, "Pure Spinors, Function Superspaces And Supergravity Theories In Ten-Dimensions And Eleven-Dimensions," Phys. Lett. B **273**, 90 (1991). P. S. Howe, "Pure Spinors Lines In Superspace And Ten-Dimensional Supersymmetric Theories," Phys. Lett. B **258**, 141 (1991) [Addendum-ibid. B **259**, 511 (1991)].
- [16] N. Berkovits and P. S. Howe, "Ten-dimensional supergravity constraints from the pure spinor formalism for the superstring", Nucl. Phys. B **635** (2002) 75 [arXiv:hep-th/0112160].
- [17] N. Berkovits, M. Bershadsky, T. Hauer, S. Zhukov and B. Zwiebach, *Superstring theory on $AdS(2) \times S(2)$ as a coset supermanifold*, Nucl. Phys. B **567**, 61 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9907200].
- [18] I. Bena, J. Polchinski and R. Roiban, *Hidden symmetries of the $AdS(5) \times S^{*5}$ superstring*, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 046002 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0305116].
- [19] G. Arutyunov and S. Frolov, *Superstrings on $AdS_4 \times CP^3$ as a Coset Sigma-model*, arXiv:0806.4940 [hep-th].
- [20] B. Stefanski jr., *Green-Schwarz action for Type IIA strings on $AdS_4 \times CP^3$* , arXiv:0806.4948 [hep-th].
- [21] I. Adam, A. Dekel, L. Mazzucato and Y. Oz, *Integrability of type II superstrings on Ramond-Ramond backgrounds in various dimensions*, JHEP **0706**, 085 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0702083].
- [22] I. Adam, P. A. Grassi, L. Mazzucato, Y. Oz and S. Yankielowicz, "Non-critical pure spinor superstrings," JHEP **0703**, 091 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0605118].

- [23] N. Berkovits, *Conformal field theory for the superstring in a Ramond-Ramond plane wave background*, JHEP **0204**, 037 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0203248].
- [24] K. Sugiyama and K. Yoshida, *Type IIA string and matrix string on pp-wave*, Nucl. Phys. B **644**, 128 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0208029].
- [25] T. Nishioka and T. Takayanagi, *On Type IIA Penrose Limit and N=6 Chern-Simons Theories*, arXiv:0806.3391 [hep-th].
- [26] G. Grignani, T. Harmark, M. Orselli and G. W. Semenoff, *Finite size Giant Magnons in the string dual of N=6 superconformal Chern-Simons theory*, arXiv:0807.0205 [hep-th].
- [27] D. Gaiotto, S. Giombi and X. Yin, *Spin Chains in N=6 Superconformal Chern-Simons-Matter Theory*, arXiv:0806.4589 [hep-th].
- [28] N. Berkovits and C. Vafa, *Towards a Worldsheet Derivation of the Maldacena Conjecture*, JHEP **0803**, 031 (2008) [arXiv:0711.1799 [hep-th]].
- [29] R. D'Auria, P. Fré, P.A. Grassi, and M. Trigiante, *in preparation*.
- [30] N. Berkovits, C. Vafa and E. Witten, *Conformal field theory of AdS background with Ramond-Ramond flux*, JHEP **9903**, 018 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9902098].
- [31] N. Berkovits, *A New Limit of the $AdS_5 \times S^5$ Sigma Model*, JHEP **0708**, 011 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0703282].
- [32] N. Berkovits, *BRST cohomology and nonlocal conserved charges*, JHEP **0502**, 060 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0409159].
- [33] S. Ferrara and C. Fronsdal, *Conformal Maxwell theory as a singleton field theory on $AdS(5)$, IIB three branes and duality*, Class. Quant. Grav. **15**, 2153 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9712239].
- [34] G. Dall'Agata, D. Fabbri, C. Fraser, P. Fre, P. Termonia and M. Trigiante, *The $Osp(8-4)$ singleton action from the supermembrane*, Nucl. Phys. B **542**, 157 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9807115].